JC

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/445,004	12/03/1999	RISTO FORSSTROM	3397-84PUS	9344

7590 08/14/2002

MICHAEL C STUART
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE
551 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 1210
NEW YORK, NY 10176

EXAMINER
PARADISO, JOHN ROGER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3721	

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/445,004	Applicant(s) FORSSTROM ET AL
	Examiner John R. Paradiso	Art Unit 3721

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the c rrespondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 May 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) *6-11* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *6-11* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 5/20/2002 have been fully considered.

2. Applicant's arguments regarding the KURACHI reference are persuasive and the previous rejection is withdrawn. A new rejection appears below.

3. Applicant states on page 5 of his Response that "Abt's air nozzle does not operate to 'blow air along the surface of said wrapper feeding table so as to guide the wrapper end along the surface of said wrapper feeding table toward said means for feeding the wrapper end', as recited in independent claim 9."

However, Examiner points out that while ABT does not blow air along a table, it does blow the leading edge of a web of material into position to be pulled by feed rollers. The argument, however, is moot in view of the new grounds for rejection below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EAVES ET AL (US 4574566) in view of PETER ET AL (US 4243186).

EAVES ET AL discloses a wrapping machine in which a supply roll (13) of paper is rolled out, the leading edge of the paper web (12) being drawn between drawing rollers (44) and past sensors (48) to determine the web's presence/position. The web falls onto the wrapping surface and is used to wrap articles. (See EAVES ET AL Figure 1.)

EAVES ET AL does not specifically disclose the leading edge of the web being guided to the drawing rollers by an air nozzle or the supply roll being turned in a reverse direction until the leading edge is sensed on the table.

PETER ET AL discloses a threading system in which a supply roll (40) is rotated opposite its feed direction until the leading edge of the web is sensed by sensors (94, 98) on the flowpath table side. The leading edge is blown toward the drawing means by an air flow (76) which is being read as an air nozzle, since air flow must inherently originate at a nozzle of some type. The supply roll is then turned in a feed direction. (See PETER ET AL column 7 lines 45-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an air nozzle, as taught by PETER ET AL, in the invention of EAVES ET AL in order to guide the leading edge of the web onto the table and to the drawing means without manual aid and without using more physical means that could crimp or damage the web.

It would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of EAVES ET AL to turn the supply roll in a

reverse direction until the end is caught by the air flow, as taught by PETER ET AL, in order to allow the air flow to do the work of threading the leading edge and minimizing human contact.

Reference Citations

6. The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure:

- DYLLA discloses a wrapping machine with a supply roll whose free end is spliced and which uses a sensor to detect the free end (See DYLLA column 3 lines 29-47).
- GIORGIO ET AL discloses a threading mechanism in which the supply roll is first counter-rotated to engage the leading edge of the web.
- TOLINI ET AL discloses a threading mechanism in which the supply roll is first counter-rotated to engage the leading edge of the web.
- HORSLEY discloses a threading mechanism in which the supply roll is first counter-rotated to engage the leading edge of the web.
- NARUKAMI discloses a threading apparatus.
- KAGAWA ET AL discloses a threading mechanism in which the supply roll is first counter-rotated to engage the leading edge of the web.
- KIYOHARA ET AL discloses a threading mechanism in which the supply roll is first counter-rotated to engage the leading edge of the web on a table.
- HAMILTON discloses a wrapping machine in which a web is guided onto a wrapping table.

- NISKANEN ET AL discloses a wrapping machine in which a web is guided onto a wrapping table.
- HOOPER ET AL discloses a wrapping machine in which a web is guided onto a wrapping table.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Paradiso. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday, 1:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m. (ET).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada, can be reached at the number listed below.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the 3700 Technology Center receptionist.

Examiner John Paradiso (703) 308-2825
Fax (Direct to Examiner): (703) 746-3253
Supervisor Rinaldi Rada (703) 308-2187
Receptionist (703) 308-1148

August 11, 2002